

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/829,314	DZIK, STEVEN C.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert C. Scheibel	2616	

All Participants:

(1) Robert C. Scheibel.

(2) Eamon J. Wall (Reg. No. 39,414).

Status of Application: _____

(3) Michael Bentley (Reg. No. 52,613).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 5 December 2006

Time: 3-5:30 PM EST

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 2, 13, 14, 25, 26, 27, and 29

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 12-7-06
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In a series of conversations and voice messages during the above time period, Examiner requested that the claim language be modified to more clearly indicate how the length and/or play time of the second packet is adjusted using the pitch period associated with the second packet. Mr. Bentley and Mr. Wall agreed to these changes to the independent claims and also requested the corrections to the dependent claims 2, 14, and 29 contained in the enclosed Examiner's Amendment..